

COMPLETE ISOMETRIES INTO C^* -ALGEBRAS

DAVID P. BLECHER AND DAMON M. HAY

ABSTRACT. We give various characterizations of into (not necessarily onto) complete isometries between C^* -algebras, generalizing a classical result of Holsztynski. Our results are related to a natural embedding of the noncommutative Shilov boundary in a second dual.

1. INTRODUCTION.

The classical Banach-Stone theorem characterizes onto linear isometries between $C(K)$ spaces, that is, between commutative unital C^* -algebras. These results have been extended in many directions. We are concerned in the present paper with linear isometries which are not necessarily surjective (i.e. onto). In the case of $C(K)$ spaces these isometries were characterized by Holsztynski [14]:

Theorem 1.1. *Let K_1, K_2 be compact Hausdorff spaces. A linear map $T : C(K_1) \rightarrow C(K_2)$ is an isometry if and only if T is contractive, and there exists a closed subset E of K_2 , and two continuous functions $\gamma : E \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$ and $\varphi : E \rightarrow K_1$, with φ surjective, such that*

$$T(f)(y) = \gamma(y)f(\varphi(y))$$

for all $y \in E$.

Here $\mathbb{T}$ is the unit circle. Informally, the result is saying that for any isometry T there is a certain ‘part E of the space $B = C(K_2)$ acts on’, such that T ‘compressed to this part’ has a particularly nice form, a form which amongst other things ensures that T is an isometry. The action of T on the ‘complementary part’ plays little role in the fact that T is an isometry. If $T(1) = 1$, then the γ may be omitted in the theorem, and then T compressed to E is the composition operator $f \mapsto f \circ \varphi$, which is an isometric homomorphism.

In the present paper we state noncommutative versions of this result. For surjective isometries between C^* -algebras the first ‘noncommutative Banach-Stone theorem’ is due to R. V. Kadison [15]. We will use ideas of Arveson, Choi and Effros, Hamana, and Kirchberg (although our paper is fairly self-contained). We will consider (not necessarily surjective) linear maps $T : A \rightarrow B$ between C^* -algebras, and establish several criteria which are each equivalent to T being a linear complete isometry.

To introduce the first such criterion, we will need some simple notation. Suppose that K, H are Hilbert spaces, with closed subspaces L, M respectively, that X is an operator space, and that $T : X \rightarrow B(K, H)$. It is clear that the following are equivalent:

- (i) $T(X)L \subset M$ and $T(X)L^\perp \subset M^\perp$,

Date: March 5, 2002.

This research was supported in part by grants from the National Science Foundation.

- (ii) $T(X)L \subset M$ and $T(X)^*M \subset L$,
- (iii) $T(x)P_L = P_M T(x)P_L = P_M T(x)$ for all $x \in X$.

In this case there are unitaries U and V such that $UT(\cdot)V$ is of ‘block diagonal’ form

$$\begin{bmatrix} R(\cdot) & 0 \\ 0 & S(\cdot) \end{bmatrix}$$

where $R : X \rightarrow B(L, M)$ and $S : X \rightarrow B(L^\perp, M^\perp)$. For example, $R = P_M T(\cdot)P_L$. We have $\|T(x)\| = \max\{\|R(x)\|, \|S(x)\|\}$ for $x \in X$, and similarly for matrices. In this case we say that R is a *reducing compression* of T .

A similar notion exists in the more abstract setting of maps $T : X \rightarrow M$ from an operator space X into a W^* -algebra M . We say that R is a reducing compression of T , if there exist projections $p, q \in M$ such that $R = qT(\cdot)p = T(\cdot)p = qT(\cdot)$. Setting $S = (1 - q)T(\cdot)(1 - p)$, we have $R + S = T$, and $\|T(x)\| = \max\{\|R(x)\|, \|S(x)\|\}$ for $x \in X$, and similarly for matrices. Representing the W^* -algebra M on a Hilbert space, and choosing orthonormal bases suitably, we may write $T(\cdot)$ as a block diagonal matrix $R(\cdot) \oplus S(\cdot)$ as in the previous paragraph. Next, if $T : X \rightarrow B$ maps into a C^* -algebra B , we will say that a map $R : X \rightarrow B^{**}$ is a reducing $\wedge$ -compression of T , if R is a reducing compression of $\hat{} \circ T$, where $\hat{}$ is the canonical 1-1 $*$ -homomorphism of B into the W^* -algebra B^{**} . If we take the universal representation of B on a Hilbert space H_u , then $B^{**} \subset B(H_u)$, and there are two subspaces of H_u with respect to which T has a 2×2 matrix representation $R \oplus S$ as in the last paragraph.

We may now state our first characterization of complete isometries. Namely a linear map $T : A \rightarrow B$ between C^* -algebras is a complete isometry if and only if T is completely contractive and T has a reducing $\wedge$ -compression of the form $u\pi(\cdot)$, for a $*$ -homomorphism π defined on A , and a certain partial isometry u . If further T is unital (i.e. $T(1) = 1$), then $u = 1$ and the S above is completely positive. This is a generalization of an old result of Choi and Effros (7.1 in [7]).

Again we see as in the commutative case that it is the 1-1 $*$ -homomorphism ‘part’ which makes T a complete isometry, the S plays little role.

Unfortunately, the π and S mentioned above map into B^{**} and not into B . Considering the commutative results mentioned above, one would expect the 1-1 $*$ -homomorphism π to map into a quotient of B by a closed ideal J (recall that in the commutative case, quotients of $C(K)$ by closed ideals correspond to closed subsets E of K). We do have such a variant of our theorem. For example if A, B are unital C^* -algebras, then we have a characterization of complete isometries which is a precise noncommutative analogue of 1.1, but in terms of a left ideal J in B , a $*$ -homomorphism π from A into some sort of quotient of B involving J , and a partial isometry u in this quotient. See Theorem 3.1 (vi). However a noncommutative obstacle arises: unless J is a two-sided ideal (and this is not generally possible in our situation), then this quotient is not generally a C^* -algebra, nor is it an operator algebra. (See [17] Lemma 2.3 for additional discussion of this point.) Nonetheless, this is not a significant obstacle, since the calculations we need to do in this ‘uncomfortable quotient’ work out quite easily. In Section 2, we discuss some elementary facts about these quotients. Also, these quotients of B contain a C^* -algebra for which the products we need to consider in these quotients are well defined. Complete isometries between C^* -algebras are discussed in Section 3.

Our results generalize immediately to nonselfadjoint algebras. While the adaptation is quite trivial, there are some interesting applications of this generalization which we discuss in [5].

We remark that our methods depend strongly on the ‘complete isometry’ condition; and thus have no overlap with work on isometries of operator algebras.

We end this introduction with some notation and basic facts which will be useful. We write H, K, L for Hilbert spaces. Perhaps confusingly, we will use the symbols I, J, K for ideals in a C^* -algebra. All ideals are taken to be uniformly closed. A projection on a Hilbert space, or in a C^* -algebra, will mean an orthogonal projection. If Y is a subspace of X we write q_Y or q for the natural quotient map $X \rightarrow X/Y$. If S is a subset of a C^* -algebra B , then we write $C_B^*(S)$ for the C^* -subalgebra of B generated by S . By ‘c.a.i.’ we mean a contractive approximate identity.

If X, Y are subspaces of a Banach algebra, we write XY for the *uniform closure* of the set of finite sums of products of the form xy for $x \in X, y \in Y$. For example, if J is a left ideal of a C^* -algebra A , then with this convention J^*J will be a C^* -algebra. This convention extends to three sets, thus $JJ^*J = J$ for a left ideal of a C^* -algebra, as is well known.

For the purposes of this paper we define a *triple system* to be a (uniformly closed) subspace X of a C^* -algebra such that $XX^*X \subset X$. By ‘subspace’ we will allow for example spaces such as $B(K, H)$, regarded as the ‘1-2-corner’ of the C^* -algebra $B(H \oplus K, H \oplus K)$ in the usual way. The important structure on a triple system is the ‘triple product’ xy^*z . A ‘triple subsystem’ is a uniformly closed vector subspace of a triple system which is closed under this triple product.

It is well known that $XX^*X = X$ for a triple system X . Also, it is clear that XX^* and X^*X are C^* -algebras, which we will call the left and right C^* -algebras of X respectively, and X is a $(XX^*) - (X^*X)$ -bimodule. A linear map $T : X \rightarrow Y$ between triple systems is a *triple morphism* if $T(xy^*z) = T(x)T(y)^*T(z)$ for all $x, y, z \in X$. Triple systems are operator spaces, and triple morphisms behave very similarly to $*$ -homomorphisms between C^* -algebras: triple morphisms are automatically completely contractive and have closed range. A triple morphism is completely isometric if it is 1-1. The kernel of a triple morphism on X is a ‘triple ideal’ (that is, a uniformly closed $(XX^*) - (X^*X)$ -subbimodule). The quotient of a triple system by a triple ideal is a triple system in an obvious way. If one factors a triple morphism by its kernel one obtains a 1-1 triple morphism on the quotient triple system. Finally, a triple morphism $T : X \rightarrow Y$ between triple systems canonically induces a $*$ -homomorphism $\pi : X^*X \rightarrow Y^*Y$ between the associated right C^* -algebras, via the prescription $\pi(x^*y) = T(x)^*T(y)$. Similarly for the left C^* -algebras. These results are all rather old, may be found in [12], and are related to results of Harris and Kaup.

It is well known that triple systems are ‘the same thing’ as Hilbert C^* -modules, although there is a slight difference of emphasis in the two theories. In particular, it is sometimes convenient to view triple systems as *strong Morita equivalence bimodules*, and vice versa. This allows us to apply the known theory of Morita equivalence [22, 24]. If A and B are C^* -algebras, then an equivalence $A - B$ -bimodule Y is an $A - B$ -bimodule which is also both a full left and a full right Hilbert C^* -module (over A and B respectively), such that the left and right inner products are compatible:

$$[x, y]z = x\langle y, z \rangle$$

for all $x, y, z \in Y$. It is easy to see (by looking at the so-called ‘linking C^* -algebra’) that such Y is a triple system, and $Y^*Y \cong B$ and $YY^* \cong A$ $*$ -isomorphically. Conversely, any triple system is an equivalence $(YY^*) - (Y^*Y)$ -bimodule. Triple ideals in an equivalence $A - B$ -bimodule are precisely the closed $A - B$ -submodules.

If X is a ‘unital operator space’ (i.e. an operator space containing a fixed element e , such that there exist complete isometries $T : X \rightarrow B(H)$ with $T(e) = I_H$), then there exists a C^* -envelope of X , namely a pair (B, j) consisting of a unital C^* -algebra B and a ‘unital’ complete isometry $j : X \rightarrow B$ whose range generates B as a C^* -algebra, with the following universal property: For any other pair (A, i) consisting of a unital C^* -algebra and a ‘unital’ complete isometry $i : X \rightarrow A$ whose range generates A as a C^* -algebra, there exists a (necessarily unique, unital, and surjective) $*$ -homomorphism $\pi : A \rightarrow B$ such that $\pi \circ i = j$. This we call the Arveson-Hamana theorem [1, 11], and as customary we write $C_e^*(X)$ for B or (B, j) (it is essentially unique, by the universal property). See also [3] for a more thorough discussion of this, and of the next concept too.

More generally, if X is an operator space, then there exists a *triple envelope* of X , namely a pair (Z, j) consisting of a triple system Z and a linear complete isometry $j : X \rightarrow Z$ whose range generates Z as a triple system (that is there exists no nontrivial closed triple subsystem containing $j(X)$), with the following universal property: For any other pair (W, i) consisting of a triple system and a complete isometry $i : X \rightarrow W$ whose range generates W as a triple system, there exists a (necessarily unique and necessarily surjective) triple morphism $\pi : W \rightarrow Z$ such that $\pi \circ i = j$. This theorem (dating to the late ‘80’s) is due to Hamana [12], and we write $\mathcal{T}(X)$ for Z or (Z, j) (it is essentially unique, by the universal property). It is easy to show that a C^* -envelope of a unital operator space is a triple envelope too.

A partial isometry of a triple system Z will be an $u \in Z$ with $uu^*u = u$. We say that u is an isometry of Z if u^*u is the identity of the right C^* -algebra of Z ; or equivalently, if $zu^*u = z$ for all $z \in Z$. A similar definition defines a coisometry of Z ; and a unitary of Z is a coisometry which is also an isometry of Z . These coincide with the usual definitions if Z is a C^* -algebra.

Corollary 1.2. *If $T : Z \rightarrow W$ is a (not necessarily surjective) complete isometry between triple systems or C^* -algebras, then if $T(z)$ is a partial isometry (resp. isometry, coisometry, unitary) of W then z is a partial isometry (resp. isometry, coisometry, unitary) of Z .*

Proof. Let W' be the triple subsystem of W generated by $T(Z)$. By the last mentioned theorem, there is a surjective triple morphism $\tau : W' \rightarrow Z$ taking $T(z)$ to z . The result is now clear. $\square$

A similar result holds if Z is merely an operator space (resp. unital operator space), but then the conclusion ‘of Z ’ needs to be replaced by ‘of $\mathcal{T}(Z)$ ’ (resp. ‘of $C_e^*(Z)$ ’). For example, such considerations allow one to say a little more about ‘unital operator spaces’. Suppose that (X, e) is a unital operator space in the sense above, and suppose that v is another element in X for which there exists a complete isometry $S : X \rightarrow B(K)$ with $S(v) = I_K$. Let $(C_e^*(X), j)$ be a C^* -envelope of (X, e) . Then the triple subsystem W of $B(K)$ generated by $S(X)$ is a unital C^* -algebra, and by Hamana’s theorem mentioned above, there exists a surjective triple morphism $\tau : W \rightarrow C_e^*(X)$ taking I_K to v . Thus as in the proof

above, $j(v)$ is a unitary of $C_e^*(X)$, and it is not hard to see that $(C_e^*(X), j(v)^*j(\cdot))$ is a C^* -envelope of (X, v) .

2. PRELIMINARY RESULTS.

The first several of the following Lemma's are standard in functional analysis.

Lemma 2.1. *Let X be a closed linear subspace of a Banach space Y . Then*

- (1) *As subsets of Y^{**} we have $\overline{\hat{X}}^{w*} = X^{\perp\perp}$,*
- (2) *The second dual of the inclusion map $i : X \rightarrow Y$ is a complete isometry of X^{**} onto $X^{\perp\perp}$. Thus $X^{**} \cong X^{\perp\perp}$ isometrically, via this canonical isometry.*
- (3) *$(Y/X)^{**} \cong Y^{**}/X^{\perp\perp}$ isometrically, and weak*-weak*-homeomorphically, via a canonical map, namely the 'transpose' of the canonical isomorphism $(Y/X)^* \rightarrow X^\perp$. This is the same as the map obtained from q^{**} , where $q : Y \rightarrow Y/X$ is the canonical quotient map, by factoring out $\text{Ker } q^{**} = X^{\perp\perp}$.*
- (4) *$\hat{Y} \cap X^{\perp\perp} = \hat{X}$.*

Proof. The proofs of (1), (2) and (3) are in any book on functional analysis.

(4): We have $\hat{X} \subset X^{\perp\perp} \subset Y^{**}$. If $\hat{y} \in \hat{Y}$ but $\hat{y} \notin \hat{X}$, choose $\phi \in Y^*$ such that $\phi(X) = 0$, but $\phi(y) \neq 0$. If $\hat{y} \in X^{\perp\perp}$ there exists by (1) a net $a_i \in X$ with $\hat{a}_i \rightarrow \hat{y}$ in the weak*-topology of Y^{**} . Hence $\phi(a_i) = 0 \rightarrow \phi(y) \neq 0$! $\square$

Sometimes we will simply write X for the subset $\hat{X}$ of X^{**} , and often we will identify X^{**} with the subspace $X^{\perp\perp}$ of Y^{**} .

Lemma 2.2. *Let J be a weak* closed left ideal in a W^* -algebra M . Then there exists a unique projection $e \in M$ with $J = Me$. Thus $M/J \cong M(1 - e)$ completely isometrically. If J is a weak* closed two-sided ideal, then e is in the center $Z(M)$.*

Lemma 2.3. *Let J be a left ideal in a C^* -algebra A . Then $J^{\perp\perp}$ is a weak* closed left ideal in the W^* -algebra A^{**} . Thus there exists a projection $e \in A^{**}$ with $J^{\perp\perp} = A^{**}e$, and*

$$(A/J)^{**} \cong A^{**}/J^{\perp\perp} \cong A^{**}(1 - e)$$

completely isometrically. The projection e may be taken to be any weak limit point in A^{**} of a right c.a.i. for J .*

Thus (composing with the canonical injection of A/J into its second dual), there is a canonical completely isometric linear map

$$d_J : A/J \rightarrow A^{**}(1 - e),$$

namely the map $a + J \mapsto \hat{a}(1 - e)$.

*If J is a two-sided ideal, then e is in the center $Z(A^{**})$.*

We will call the projection e in the last lemma the *support projection* of J .

Note that by the last Lemma we may view the quotient A/J of a C^* -algebra by a left ideal, as a subspace of the left ideal $A^{**}(1 - e)$ of A^{**} . Thus A/J possesses a 'partial triple product' $\{\cdot, \cdot, \cdot\}$, namely $\{x, y, z\} = xy^*z$ if $x, y, z \in A/J$ and if xy^*z (viewed as a product in $A^{**}(1 - e)$) is again in A/J .

Similar considerations apply for quotients by right ideals. Also, A/J possesses a natural 'involution' $A/J \rightarrow A/J^*$. If we write this involution as $*$, then $(a + J)^* = a^* + J^*$ for $a \in A$.

Next we consider the quotient $A/(J + J^*)$. That the sum of a left ideal and a right ideal in a C^* -algebra is norm closed is apparently first due to Combes and Perdrizet;

Rudin showed this more generally in a Banach algebra (if J has a bounded right approximate identity). See [8] for references, and for amendment of a proof due to Kirchberg that does the Banach algebra case too.

We need a generalization of Lemma 2.3:

Lemma 2.4. ([16]) *Let J be a left ideal in a C^* -algebra A , and let K be a right ideal in A . Then $J + K$ is norm closed in A . Let e be the support projection of J in A^{**} (see Lemma 2.3), and let f be the support projection of K . Then the weak* closure of $J + K$ in A^{**} , equals $fA^{**} + A^{**}e$. Also,*

$$(A/(J + K))^{**} \cong A^{**}/(J + K)^{\perp\perp} \cong (1 - f)A^{**}(1 - e)$$

completely isometrically. Thus (composing with the canonical injection of $A/(J + K)$ into its second dual), there is a canonical completely isometric map

$$c_{J+K} : A/(J + K) \rightarrow (1 - f)A^{**}(1 - e),$$

namely the map $a + (J + K) \mapsto (1 - f)\hat{a}(1 - e)$.

Proof. That $J + K$ is norm closed is mentioned above. We provide the simple proof of the other assertions. Consider the completely contractive weak* continuous projection $\Phi : x \mapsto (1 - f)x(1 - e)$ on A^{**} . The kernel of Φ is $fA^{**} + A^{**}e$. Thus $fA^{**} + A^{**}e$ is weak* closed, and therefore it contains the weak* closure of $J + K$. However, it is fairly clear (using Lemma 2.3 and 2.1 (1) if necessary) that $J + K$ is weak* dense in $fA^{**} + A^{**}e$. Thus $\text{Ker } \Phi$ is the weak* closure of $J + K$. Since Φ is a complete quotient map, the first displayed equations follow. The rest is clear. $\square$

In the last result, if $K = J^*$, then $e = f$. Since $(1 - e)A^{**}(1 - e)$ is then a C^* -algebra, we may regard the quotient $A/(J + J^*)$ above as a ‘partial C^* -algebra’, and write $x * y$ for the partial product on $A/(J + J^*)$. This is not the product one would think of first; it is not $q(a_1) * q(a_2) = q(a_1 a_2)$ for most $a_1, a_2 \in A$ (here $q = q_{J+J^*}$). Extending this notation, we will also write $x * y = z$ if $x, z \in A/J$, $y \in A/(J + J^*)$, and if $xy = z$ in $(1 - e)A^{**}(1 - e)$. That is, the natural module action $A^{**}(1 - e) \times (1 - e)A^{**}(1 - e) \rightarrow A^{**}(1 - e)$ makes A/J a ‘partial right $A/(J + J^*)$ -module’. In fact A/J has an $A/(J + J^*)$ -valued inner product. This is because the canonical bilinear map $A/J^* \times A/J \rightarrow A/(J + J^*)$ is easily seen to be well defined. Thus we may think of A/J as a ‘partial right Hilbert C^* -module’ over $A/(J + J^*)$. Similarly, A/J^* is a ‘partial left Hilbert C^* -module’ over $A/(J + J^*)$.

As noted in [16, 17], if A is a unital C^* -algebra then the proof above of 2.4 shows that $A/(J + J^*)$ is an operator system. Indeed it is what Kirchberg calls a C^* -system, namely an operator system whose second dual is a C^* -algebra. We shall not need this notation, but we refer the reader to his very deep papers (see e.g. [18] and references therein) for an astonishing converse, and a host of related notions, and deep consequences. If A is unital, we recall from [16, 17] the ‘two-sided multiplier algebra’ $M(A/(J + J^*))$. If A is unital, then $M(A/(J + J^*))$ is a unital subspace of $A/(J + J^*)$ which is actually a C^* -algebra, indeed which may be viewed as a *-subalgebra of $(1 - e)A^{**}(1 - e)$. More generally, if A is nonunital, we define $M_0(A/(J + J^*))$ to be the set $\{b \in A/(J + J^*) : b * (A/(J + J^*)) \subset A/(J + J^*), (A/(J + J^*)) * b \subset A/(J + J^*)\}$. Here $*$ is the ‘partial product’ on $A/(J + J^*)$ discussed just after the proof of 2.4. Then $M_0(A/(J + J^*))$ is a *-subspace of $A/(J + J^*)$ which is also a C^* -algebra, indeed which may be viewed as a *-subalgebra of $(1 - e)A^{**}(1 - e)$. If A is unital then $M_0(A/(J + J^*)) = M(A/(J + J^*))$. It is interesting that if A is unital then $w = a + (J + J^*)$ is in

$M(A/(J + J^*))$ if and only if $w, w * w^*$ and $w^* * w$ are in $A/(J + J^*)$ (see [16]). We will not use this fact though.

We say that a linear map $T : C \rightarrow A/(J + J^*)$ defined on an algebra C is a *homomorphism* if T maps into $M_0(A/(J + J^*))$, and T is a homomorphism into this algebra. A similar notation applies to $*$ -homomorphisms into $A/(J + J^*)$. Finally, we say that $u \in A/J$ is a *partial isometry* of A/J if u^*u is a projection in $M_0(A/(J + J^*))$.

We remark that if A is commutative, then $J = J^* = J + J^*$, $A/(J + J^*)$ is an algebra, and ‘homomorphisms’ in the sense above into $A/(J + J^*)$ are exactly the algebra homomorphisms.

There seems to be another C^* -subalgebra of $M_0(A/(J + J^*))$ which is of interest. Namely, we let $M_{00}(A/(J + J^*))$ be the set $\{b \in A/(J + J^*) : b * (A/J^*) \subset A/J^*, (A/J) * b \subset A/J\}$. Here $*$ are the ‘partial module products’ discussed just after the proof of 2.4. Then $M_{00}(A/(J + J^*))$ is a $*$ -subspace of $A/(J + J^*)$ which is also a C^* -algebra, indeed which may be viewed as a $*$ -subalgebra of $(1 - e)A^{**}(1 - e)$.

If J is a left ideal and K a right ideal of a C^* -algebra A , then we say that a linear map $T : Z \rightarrow A/(J + K)$ defined on a triple system Z is a *partial triple morphism* if T composed with the canonical map $c_{J+K} : A/(J + K) \rightarrow (1 - f)A^{**}(1 - e)$ discussed in 2.4, is a triple morphism.

The following result then follows immediately from well known facts about $*$ -homomorphisms and triple morphisms mentioned in our introduction.

Proposition 2.5. *Let J be a left ideal in a C^* -algebra A let K be a right ideal in A , and let $T : C \rightarrow A/(J + J^*)$ (resp. $Z \rightarrow A/(J + K)$) be a $*$ -homomorphism (resp. partial triple morphism) defined on a C^* -algebra C (resp. triple system Z). Then T is completely isometric if and only if T is 1-1.*

Lemma 2.6. *Let B be a C^* -algebra, let A be a C^* -subalgebra of B and let I be a closed two-sided ideal in A . Set J to be the closed left ideal of B generated by I . That is, $J = BI$. Then $J \cap A = I$. The canonical map $r : A/I \rightarrow B/J$ is a linear 1-1 complete isometry. The canonical map $t : A/I \rightarrow B/(J + J^*)$ has range within $M_{00}(B/(J + J^*))$, and is a 1-1 $*$ -homomorphism into this space.*

Proof. Certainly $I \subset J \cap A$, but if $z \in J \cap A$ and if $\{e_i\}$ is a c.a.i. for I , then $ze_i \rightarrow z$ (since $z \in J = BI$). However since $z \in A$ then $ze_i \in I$. Therefore $z \in I$.

Now it is easy to see that the canonical map $r : A/I \rightarrow B/J$ is a linear 1-1 complete contraction. Note that $(A/I)^{**} \cong A^{**}/I^{**} \cong A^{**}(1_{A^{**}} - p)$ for a central projection $p \in A^{**}$ by 2.2. We claim that $J^{**} = B^{**}p$, so that $B^{**}/J^{**} \cong B^{**}(1_{B^{**}} - p)$. Certainly since $p \in I^{**} \subset J^{**}$, we have $B^{**}p \subset J^{**}$. Conversely, if $z \in J^{**}$ and if $z_i \in J$ converge weak* to z , then $z_i = z_i p \rightarrow zp$, so that $z = zp \in B^{**}p$.

Note too that $\hat{a}p = p\hat{a}$ for all $a \in A$, since p is central in A^{**} .

Consider the sequence of canonical completely contractive maps

$$A/I \rightarrow B/J \rightarrow B/(J + J^*) \xrightarrow{c_{J+J^*}} (1_{B^{**}} - p)B^{**}(1_{B^{**}} - p) \subset B^{**}.$$

Explicitly, the composition θ of all of these maps takes

$$(a + I) \mapsto (a + J) \mapsto (\hat{a} + (J + J^*)) \mapsto (1_{B^{**}} - p)\hat{a}(1_{B^{**}} - p) = \hat{a}(1_{B^{**}} - p).$$

If $\theta(a + I) = 0$ then $\hat{a} = \hat{a}p$. This means that $\hat{a} \in \hat{A} \cap I^{**}$, so that $a \in I$ by Lemma 2.1 (4). Thus θ is 1-1.

Since p is central in A^{**} , we have that $\hat{B}(1-p)\hat{a}(1-p) \in \hat{B}(1-p)$ and $(1-p)\hat{a}(1-p)\hat{B} \in (1-p)\hat{B}$. Thus if we use the fact in 2.4 that c_{J+J^*} there is 1-1, we see that $a+(J+J^*) \in M_0(B/(J+J^*))$. Similarly, $a+(J+J^*) \in M_{00}(B/(J+J^*))$.

To complete the proof of the theorem, it suffices to show that θ is a $*$ -homomorphism. However this is easy, for example note that

$$(1_{B^{**}} - p)\hat{x}(1_{B^{**}} - p)\hat{y}(1_{B^{**}} - p) = (1_{B^{**}} - p)\widehat{xy}(1_{B^{**}} - p)$$

for $x, y \in A$. $\square$

As one application of the last result, we may see very easily that the C^* -envelope $(C_e^*(X), j)$ of a unital subspace or unital subalgebra of a unital C^* -algebra B , may be identified with a certain C^* -subalgebra of the second dual of B :

Corollary 2.7. *Suppose that X is a unital operator space, and that $T : X \rightarrow B$ is a unital complete isometry into a unital C^* -algebra B . Then there is a projection $p \in B^{**}$, such that if we define $R : X \rightarrow (1-p)B^{**}(1-p)$ to be the map $R(x) = (1-p)\widehat{T(x)}(1-p)$ for $x \in X$, then also $R(x) = \widehat{T(x)}(1-p) = (1-p)\widehat{T(x)}$ for $x \in X$, and $(C_{B^{**}}^*(R(X)), R)$ is a C^* -envelope of X .*

Proof. Let $A = C_B^*(T(X))$. By the universal property of the C^* -envelope $(C_e^*(X), j)$ discussed in the introduction, there exists a surjective $*$ -homomorphism $\theta : A \rightarrow C_e^*(X)$ such that $\theta(T(x)) = j(x)$ for all $x \in X$. Thus if $I = \text{Ker } \theta$, then A/I is a C^* -algebra, and there is a $*$ -isomorphism $\psi : C_e^*(X) \rightarrow A/I$ with $\psi(j(x)) = T(x)+I$ for all $x \in X$. If p is the support projection of I in the center of A^{**} , then we may view p as a projection in B^{**} . Also, there is a 1-1 $*$ -homomorphism $A/I \rightarrow (1-p)B^{**}(1-p)$ by the proof of Lemma 2.6. This map takes $c+I$ to $\hat{c}(1-p)$. Composing this map with ψ gives a 1-1 $*$ -homomorphism $C_e^*(X) \rightarrow (1-p)B^{**}(1-p)$ which takes $j(x)$ to $(1-p)\widehat{T(x)}(1-p)$. $\square$

Lemma 2.8. *Let B be a C^* -algebra, let Z be a uniformly closed triple subsystem of B and let N be a triple ideal in Z . Set J (resp. K) to be the closed left (resp. right) ideal of B generated by N . That is, $J = BN$ and $K = NB$. Then $J \cap Z = K \cap Z = N$. The canonical map $r : Z/N \rightarrow B/J$ (resp. $s : Z/N \rightarrow B/(J+K)$) taking $z+N$ to $z+J$ (resp. $z+(J+K)$) are linear complete isometries. Indeed r and s are completely isometric partial triple morphisms.*

Proof. Certainly $N \subset J \cap Z$, but if $z \in J \cap Z$ and if $\{e_i\}$ is a c.a.i. for $I = N^*N$, then $ze_i \rightarrow z$ (since $z \in J = BN$). However since $z \in Z$ then $ze_i \in N$. Therefore $z \in N$. Similarly, $K \cap Z = N$. Also the canonical map $r : Z/N \rightarrow B/J$ is a linear 1-1 complete contraction. Set $I = N^*N$ and $D = Z^*Z$. We claim that $J = BI$. Since $BN^*N \subset BN$, we have $BI \subset J$. On the other hand, since N is a triple system, we have $N = NN^*N$. Thus $BN = BNN^*N \subset BN^*N$, so that $J \subset BI$. This proves the claim. We are also put in the situation of the previous Lemma, so that there is a unique central projection p in D^{**} with $D^{**}p = I^{**}$ and $B^{**}p = J^{**}$.

The map we are interested in from $Z/N \rightarrow B^{**}(1-p)$ is precisely the map $(z+N) \mapsto \hat{z}(1-p)$. Since p commutes with D^{**} we have for $z_1, z_2, z_3 \in Z$ that

$$\hat{z}_1\hat{z}_2^*\hat{z}_3(1-p) = \hat{z}_1(1-p)(1-p)\hat{z}_2^*\hat{z}_3(1-p)$$

which says that $d_J \circ r$ is a triple morphism. Thus r is a partial triple morphism. Since r is 1-1 it is completely isometric by Proposition 2.5. To see that s is 1-1, or equivalently, completely isometric we will need some information from the following

Lemma. Namely, if q is as in the following Lemma, then it is easy to see (by symmetry) that q is the support projection for $K = NB$; and that the completely isometric map $(z + N) \mapsto \hat{z}(1 - p)$ discussed above from $Z/N \rightarrow B^{**}(1 - p)$ actually maps into $(1 - q)B^{**}(1 - p)$, and that this map factors completely contractively through s . That is, this map is the composition of s and c_{J+K} mentioned in 2.4. Thus s is a complete isometry. $\square$

Note that the ideal K above is ‘retrievable’ from J and B and Z . Namely, $K = (J \cap Z)B$.

Lemma 2.9. *Let B, Z, N be as in the previous lemma. Associated with the support projection $p \in B^{**}$ for N^*N (mentioned in the previous proof), there is a projection $q \in B^{**}$, such that $qz = qzp = zp$ for all $z \in Z$. Indeed such q may be taken to be the support projection for NN^* , viewed as a projection in B^{**} .*

Proof. This will be clear to those familiar with the Morita equivalence of W^* -algebras [24], but for the readers convenience we sketch a more or less elementary and complete proof. In the proof above we have $D = Z^*Z$; set C to be the ‘left C^* -algebra’ ZZ^* of Z . Then it is well known from C^* -module theory that we may pick a c.a.i. $\{e_\alpha\}$ in C with terms e_α each of the form $\sum_{k=1}^n z_k z_k^*$. Pick $z \in Z$. It is an elementary item from C^* -module theory that $e_\alpha z \rightarrow z$. Consider the associated net with terms $\sum_{k=1}^n z_k p z_k^*$. This is a net in $Ball(B^{**})$ (since $z_k p z_k^* \leq z_k z_k^*$ for each k). Let q be a weak* limit point of this net in $Ball(B^{**})$. We claim that $q \in M$, where M is the W^* -algebra which is the weak* closure in B^{**} of NN^* . To see this note that p was chosen in I^{**} , and therefore lies in the weak* closure in B^{**} of N^*N . Thus $z_k p z_k^*$ lies in the weak* closure in B^{**} of ZN^*NZ^* . Since N is a left ZZ^* -module, and since $N = NN^*N$ as noted in the introduction, we have $ZN^* = ZN^*NN^* \subset NN^*$. Thus $ZN^*NZ^* \subset NN^*$. This proves the claim.

Since

$$\sum_{k=1}^n z_k p z_k^* z = \sum_{k=1}^n z_k z_k^* z p = \sum_{k=1}^n z_k p z_k^* z p$$

in the limit we obtain $qz = zp = qzp$. Thus $q^2 z = qzp = qz$. Hence $q^2 x = qx$ for all $x \in C$, and by a weak* approximation argument, for all $x \in M$. Taking $x = 1_M$ shows that $q^2 = q$, so that q is a (contractive and therefore selfadjoint) projection in M .

Finally note that if $z, w \in Z$, then $qzw^* = zpw^*$. But we saw above that zpw^* lies in the weak* closure in B^{**} of NN^* . That is, $qzw^* \in M$. By a weak* approximation argument, $qR \subset M$, where R is the W^* -algebra which is the weak* closure in B^{**} of ZZ^* . Conversely, if $z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4 \in N$, then $qz_1 z_2^* z_3 z_4^* = z_1 p z_2^* z_3 z_4^* = z_1 z_2^* z_3 z_4^*$, since p is the identity of I^{**} . Since $NN^*NN^* = NN^*$, we have $qx = x$ for all $x \in NN^*$, and therefore also for all $x \in M$. Thus $qR = M$. $\square$

Variants of the following lemma are no doubt well known:

Lemma 2.10. *Let $T : A \rightarrow Z$ be a linear map from a C^* -algebra onto a triple subsystem Z of a W^* -algebra M . Then T is a triple morphism if and only if there exists a surjective $*$ -homomorphism $\theta : A \rightarrow Z^*Z$, and a partial isometry $u \in M$, such that the projection u^*u is the identity of the W^* -algebra $\overline{\text{Ran } \theta}^{weak*}$, and such that*

$$T(a) = u\theta(a) \quad \& \quad \theta(a) = u^*T(a)$$

for all $a \in A$. Moreover $\theta(a_1^*a_2) = T(a_1)^*T(a_2)$ for all $a_1, a_2 \in A$; and if T is 1-1, then so is θ . If A is unital, then we may choose u in the equivalence above to be $T(1)$, and this is a unitary of Z , and also $Z = u^*(Z^*Z)$. If A is nonunital then we may choose u to be any weak* limit point of $\{T(e_\alpha)\}$, for any c.a.i. $\{e_\alpha\}$ of A .

Proof. (Sketch.) If we define $\theta(a_1^*a_2) = T(a_1)^*T(a_2)$ then as stated in the introduction, θ is a well defined *-homomorphism $A \rightarrow Z^*Z$. We have that θ is certainly onto since it may be clearly seen to have dense range. If A is unital then define $u = T(1)$, and the result is evident. If A is nonunital, then define u to be any weak* limit point of $\{T(e_\alpha)\}$, for any c.a.i. $\{e_\alpha\}$ of A . Then

$$u\theta(a_1^*a_2) = \lim T(e_\alpha)T(a_1)^*T(a_2) = \lim T(e_\alpha a_1^*a_2) = T(a_1^*a_2)$$

for $a_1, a_2 \in A$. Thus $T = u\theta(\cdot)$. Also, $u^*T(a) = \lim T(e_\alpha)^*T(a) = \lim \theta(e_\alpha^*a) = \theta(a)$. Therefore $u^*ub = b$ for all $b \in \text{Ran } \theta$, and consequently, for all b in the weak* closure N of $\text{Ran } \theta$. It is easy to see that u^*u is in N too, so that u^*u is the identity of N . $\square$

Lemmas 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.8 and 2.9 generalize without much change to ‘ideals’ in triple systems, or equivalently, to submodules of ‘equivalence bimodules’. It is folklore known to rather few that if Y is an equivalence $A - B$ -bimodule then Y^{**} is an W^* -equivalence $A^{**} - B^{**}$ -bimodule (see e.g. 5.8 in [3], [19], [9]). Weak* closed right B^{**} -submodules of Y^{**} are exactly the submodules of the form fY^{**} , for a projection f in A^{**} . Norm closed right B -submodules of Y , are precisely the subspaces R of Y such that $R^{\perp\perp} = fY^{**}$, for a projection f in A^{**} . These facts may be found for example proved in 6.6 of [4]. We will say that f is the support projection of R . As in Lemma 2.3 we have $(Y/R)^{**} \cong Y^{**}/R^{\perp\perp} \cong (1-f)Y^{**}$ completely isometrically. Similar results hold for left A -submodules L of Y ; there exists a ‘support projection’ $e \in B^{**}$. If N is an $A - B$ -submodule of Y , then by following the proof of 2.8 and 2.9, one sees that the left support projection f of N is in the center of A^{**} , the right support projection e is in the center of B^{**} , and $f\hat{y} = \hat{y}e = f\hat{y}e$ for all $y \in Y$.

There is also a generalization of 2.4 to left and right submodules of an equivalence $A - B$ -bimodule, which is more or less identical to 2.4. Since we shall not explicitly need this it is therefore omitted, although it is useful in placing the proof of the next theorem in context.

On asking Kirchberg, we ascertained that the results such as the next one are known to him, but at this point it does not appear in the literature as far as we know. This next result is the ‘nonunital’ version of 2.7:

Theorem 2.11. *Let $T : X \rightarrow Y$ be a complete isometry from an operator space into an equivalence $A - B$ -bimodule Y . Then there are projections $e \in B^{**}$ and $f \in A^{**}$, such that*

$$\widehat{T(x)e} = f\widehat{T(x)} = f\widehat{T(x)}e$$

for all $x \in X$, and such that if we define $i : X \rightarrow Y^{**}$ by $i(x) = (1-f)\widehat{T(x)} = \widehat{T(x)}(1-e) = (1-f)\widehat{T(x)}(1-e)$, and set W to be the triple subsystem of Y^{**} generated by $i(X)$, then (W, i) is a triple envelope of X .

Thus if X is a subspace of a triple system Y , then we may identify the triple envelope of X with a certain triple subsystem of Y^{**} .

Proof. Let Z be the triple subsystem of Y generated by $T(X)$, and let $(\mathcal{T}(X), j)$ be a triple envelope of X . By the universal property of $\mathcal{T}(X)$ discussed in our introduction, there exists a surjective triple morphism $\mu : Z \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(X)$ such that $\mu(T(x)) = j(x)$ for all $x \in X$. Thus if $N = \text{Ker } \mu$, then Z/N is a triple system, and there is a triple isomorphism $\xi : \mathcal{T}(X) \rightarrow Z/N$ with $\xi(j(x)) = T(x) + N$ for all $x \in X$. Let e and f be the right and left support projections of the sub-bimodule N of the triple system Z . So $e \in (Z^*Z)^{**}$, for example, and we have exactly as in 2.9, that $\hat{z}e = f\hat{z} = f\hat{z}e$ for all $z \in Z$. We will view e and f as projections in A^{**} and B^{**} respectively. Consider the map $\rho : Z/N \rightarrow (1-f)Y^{**}(1-e)$, defined by $\rho(z + N) = \hat{z}(1-e)$. If $\rho(z + N) = 0$, then $\hat{z} = \hat{z}e$. Thus

$$\hat{z} \in \hat{Z} \cap Z^{**}e = \hat{Z} \cap N^{\perp\perp} = \hat{N}$$

using 2.1 (4). Therefore $z \in N$, so that ρ is 1-1. Since $\hat{z}e = f\hat{z} = f\hat{z}e$ for all $z \in Z$, we have that

$$\widehat{xy^*z}(1-e) = \hat{x}(1-e)\hat{y}^*\hat{z}(1-e)$$

for $x, y, z \in Z$. Thus ρ is a 1-1 triple morphism. The composition $\rho \circ \xi$ is therefore a 1-1 triple morphism of $\mathcal{T}(X)$ onto W , which maps $j(x)$ to $i(x)$, for each $x \in X$. This completes the proof. $\square$

The following is a ‘nonsurjective Banach-Stone theorem’ for triple systems:

Corollary 2.12. *If $T : Z \rightarrow Y$ is a (not necessarily surjective) complete isometry between triple systems, then there exist projections e and f in the second duals of the C^* -algebras Y^*Y and YY^* respectively, such that*

$$(1-f)\widehat{T(z)} = \widehat{T(z)}(1-e) = (1-f)\widehat{T(z)}(1-e)$$

*for all $z \in Z$, and that these expressions define a 1-1 triple morphism from Z into Y^{**} .*

Proof. This follows from the previous result, together with the fact that if (W, i) is a triple envelope of a triple system, then necessarily i is a triple isomorphism. This last fact is clear from the universal property of the triple envelope. $\square$

A similar corollary, but for unital complete isometries between C^* -algebras, follows from 2.7. We will say more on this case in 3.2.

The last result says that if $T : Z \rightarrow Y$ is a complete isometry between triple systems, then there exists a ‘reducing $\wedge$ -compression of T ’ which is a triple morphism. Indeed with a little thought one may see that if one takes the ‘universal representation’ of the triple system $Y \subset B(K_u, H_u)$ (derived in an obvious way from the universal representation of the ‘linking C^* -algebra’ of Y), then there are projections e and f on K_u and H_u respectively, such that $(1-f)T(\cdot)(1-e)$ is a reducing compression of T in the sense of the introduction, and is a 1-1 triple morphism. Since we will not explicitly use this we omit the details.

3. BANACH-STONE THEOREMS FOR C^* -ALGEBRAS.

In the following we will often identify B with the subset $\hat{B}$ of B^{**} . In particular if $b \in B$ and p is a projection in B^{**} , then we will often write $b(1-p)$ for the expression $\hat{b}(1-p)$.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $T : A \rightarrow B$ be a completely contractive linear map between C^* -algebras. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) T is a complete isometry,
- (ii) there exists a C^* -subalgebra D of B , a closed two-sided ideal I in D , a $*$ -isomorphism $\pi : A \rightarrow D/I$, and a partial isometry $u \in B^{**}$, such that

$$\widehat{T(a)}(1-p) = u\pi(a)$$

and such that $u^*u\pi(a) = \pi(a)$, for all $a \in A$, where p is the support projection for I in D^{**} , viewed as an element of B^{**} . We are viewing $\pi(A)$ in the equations above as a subset of $(1-p)B^{**}(1-p)$ via the identifications $D/I \subset D^{**}/I^{**} = (1-p)D^{**}(1-p) \subset (1-p)B^{**}(1-p)$,

- (iii) there is a left ideal J and a right ideal K of B , such that $q_{J+K} \circ T$ is a 1-1 partial triple morphism from A to $B/(J+K)$,
- (iv) T possesses a reducing $\wedge$ -compression which is a 1-1 triple morphism,
- (v) there is a projection p in B^{**} , a partial isometry u in $B^{**}(1-p)$, and a 1-1 $*$ -homomorphism $\theta : A \rightarrow (1-p)B^{**}(1-p)$, such that

$$\widehat{T(\cdot)}(1-p) = u\theta(\cdot)$$

and such that $u^*u\theta(\cdot) = \theta(\cdot)$.

Further, if A is unital, then these are equivalent to

- (vi) there is a left ideal J of B , a 1-1 $*$ -homomorphism $\pi : A \rightarrow M_{00}(B/(J+J^*))$, and a partial isometry u in B/J such that

$$q_J(T(a)) = u\pi(a) \quad \& \quad \pi(a) = u^*q_J(T(a))$$

for all $a \in A$, where q_J is the canonical quotient map $B \rightarrow B/J$ (Notations as in the first and fifth paragraphs after 2.4).

- (vii) there exists a C^* -subalgebra D of B containing $T(A)^*T(A)$, a closed two-sided ideal I in D , and a $*$ -isomorphism $\pi : A \rightarrow D/I$, such that

$$q_N(T(a)) = U \pi(a)$$

for all $a \in A$, where q is the canonical quotient triple morphism from the triple subsystem $Z = T(A)D$ of B , onto the quotient of Z by the triple ideal $N = ZI$, and where U is a unitary of the triple system Z/N .

The u in (vi) (resp. U in (vii)) may be taken to be $q_J(T(1))$ (resp. $q_N(T(1))$). The projection $p \in B^{**}$ above in (ii) and (iv) may be chosen to commute with (the image in B^{**} of) $T(A)^*T(A)$. One may take either J or K to be $\{0\}$ in (iii) if one wishes.

If A is nonunital then the u in (ii) and (v) may be taken to be a weak $*$ limit point in B^{**} of $\{\widehat{T(e_\alpha)}(1-p)\}$, for some c.a.i. $\{e_\alpha\}$ of A .

Proof. We leave it as an exercise for the reader that any one of (ii)-(vi) imply (i). For example, given (v), then we have for $a \in A$ that

$$\|T(a)\| \geq \|T(a)(1-p)\| = \|u\theta(a)\| \geq \|u^*u\theta(a)\| = \|\theta(a)\| = \|a\|.$$

Thus T is an isometry. A similar calculation shows that T is a complete isometry, giving (i).

Henceforth in the proof we will assume that T is a complete isometry. Then (iv) follows immediately from 2.12 (or one may see it from the proof below). To see (iii), we follow the proof of 2.12 and 2.11, letting Z be the triple system in B generated by $T(A)$, and setting N to be the kernel of the surjective triple morphism $\rho : Z \rightarrow A$ such that $\rho(T(a)) = a$ for all $a \in A$. Then A is triple isomorphic to Z/N via the map $\xi : a \rightarrow T(a) + N$. Apply 2.8 to Z/N . We obtain a 1-1 partial

triple morphism $\psi : Z/N \rightarrow B/(J+K)$, and by composition, a 1-1 partial triple morphism $\theta : A \rightarrow B/(J+K)$. We have $\theta(a) = T(a) + (J+K)$. This implies (iii).

To see (ii), consider again the triple isomorphism $\xi : A \rightarrow Z/N$ above. Via the proof of Lemma 2.8 we may view Z/N as a triple subsystem $W = \hat{Z}(1-p)$ of $B^{**}(1-p)$, via the map $z + N \mapsto \hat{z}(1-p)$. We saw in the proof of 2.8 that p commutes with the image of Z^*Z in B^{**} . Thus

$$T(a_1)^*T(a_2)(1-p) = (1-p)T(a_1)^*T(a_2) = (1-p)T(a_1)^*T(a_2)(1-p)$$

for all $a_1, a_2 \in A$. Let $D = Z^*Z$, $I = N^*N$. By Lemma 2.10 we have $T(a)(1-p) = u\pi(a)$, for a partial isometry $u \in B^{**}(1-p)$, and a $*$ -isomorphism π' from A onto W^*W , which may be defined to be $\pi'(a) = u^*T(a)(1-p)$; or alternatively, $\pi'(a_1^*a_2) = (1-p)T(a_1)^*T(a_2)(1-p)$ if $a_1, a_2 \in A$. We saw in Lemma 2.10 that u may be taken to be a weak $*$ limit point of $\{T(e_\alpha)(1-p)\}$ in B^{**} , for any c.a.i. $\{e_\alpha\}$ of A . From the basic theory of Morita equivalence of quotients (see [23]), or the basic theory of quotients of triple systems [12], $W^*W \cong (Z^*Z)/(N^*N) = D/I$ $*$ -isomorphically, via the natural map. Write σ for the $*$ -isomorphism $A \rightarrow D/I$ corresponding to π' ; it is clear that $\sigma(a_1^*a_2) = T(a_1)^*T(a_2) + I$, for $a_1, a_2 \in A$. This gives (ii), and also (v).

Tracing the proof above of (v), we see that θ maps into $(1-p)Z^*Z(1-p) \subset c_{J+J^*}(B/(J+J^*))$. Set $\pi = c_{J+J^*}^{-1} \circ \pi' = t \circ \sigma$ (where t is as in Lemma 2.6), and $u = q_J(T(1))$, to obtain (vi).

If Z, N, D, I, ξ are as in our proof of (ii), and if one applies Lemma 2.10 to ξ , and uses the fact (also essentially used in the proof of (ii)) that the right C^* -algebra of the triple system Z/N is $*$ -isomorphic to D/I , one obtains (vii). $\square$

From (iv) of the theorem above we separate the following fact:

$$T(a)T(b)^*T(c)(1-p) = T(ab^*c)(1-p)$$

for all $a, b, c \in A$.

Remarks. 1). In the proof of (vii) we have $D = Z^*Z$ and $I = N^*N$. By the theory of quotient Morita equivalences [23] or quotient triple systems, Z/N is a full right C^* -module over D/I , so that the product in the displayed equation in (vii) makes perfect sense.

2. It is not mentioned explicitly in the theorem, but looking at the details of the proof, one sees that there is a canonical projection $q \in B^{**}$ such that $(1-q)\widehat{T(a)} = \widehat{T(a)}(1-p)$ for all a .

3. It is easy to recover Holstynski's theorem 1.1 directly from (vi) of the last theorem. We leave this as an exercise for the reader (the point is that firstly, because the isometry maps between subspaces of $C(K)$ spaces, it is completely isometric ([20] Theorem 3.8); and secondly in the commutative case left ideals are two-sided, so that $J = J^* = J + J^*$. Then $B/J = C(E)$ for some closed subset E , and now Holstynski's result is immediate using the well known correspondence between compact topological spaces and commutative C^* -algebras).

4. The known Banach-Stone theorem for surjective complete isometries between C^* -algebras is, formally, easy to derive from 3.1. That is, if T is also surjective then it is easy to see that the $*$ -homomorphism in 3.1 maps onto B , and that u is a unitary of $M(B)$. However this result also follows from much more elementary arguments.

Corollary 3.2. *Let $T : A \rightarrow B$ be a unital completely contractive linear map between unital C^* -algebras. Then saying that T is a complete isometry is equivalent to any one of (ii)-(vi) in the previous theorem, but with the following changes: One may omit all mention of u , change ‘triple morphism’ to ‘*-homomorphism’, and K to J^* , in (iii) and (iv), and note that the expression $T(a)(1-p)$ in (ii) and (iv) now coincides with $(1-p)T(a)(1-p)$. Indeed one may change the displayed equation in (vii) to read $q_I(T(a)) = \pi(a)$ for all $a \in A$; and $Z = D$ and $N = I$ in this case.*

We leave the proof of this as an exercise.

We remark that Corollary 3.2 may be generalized to the case of completely isometric linear maps $T : A \rightarrow B$ such that $T(1_A)$ is a unitary of the C^* -algebra B . For in this case, if $u = T(1_A)$, then $T' = u^*T(\cdot)$ is a unital complete isometry $A \rightarrow B$. One may then apply 3.2 to obtain a nice form for T' , and then use the fact that $T = uT'(\cdot)$. For example, one obtains the existence of a projection $p \in B^{**}$ such that $T'(\cdot)(1-p)$ is a 1-1 *-homomorphism $\pi : A \rightarrow B^{**}$, then $\widehat{T(\cdot)}(1-p) = \hat{u}\pi(\cdot)$, with $\hat{u}$ unitary of B^{**} . Clearly also we may write $T(\cdot)(1-p) = v\pi(\cdot)$, where v is a unitary of the corner $(1-q)B^{**}(1-p)$ of B^{**} ; namely $v = \hat{u}(1-p)$.

More generally still we have:

Proposition 3.3. *Suppose that $T : A \rightarrow B$ is a complete isometry between unital C^* -algebras, and suppose that $T(A)$ contains a unitary (resp. isometry, coisometry) of B . Let p, q be the associated projections in B^{**} as in 3.1 (see Remark 3 after 3.1). Then $U = \widehat{T(1)}(1-p)$ is a unitary (resp. isometry, coisometry) of the corner $(1-q)B^{**}(1-p)$ of B^{**} , and $\widehat{T(\cdot)}(1-p) = U\pi(\cdot)$ on A , where π is the 1-1 *-homomorphism $A \rightarrow (1-p)B^{**}(1-p)$ considered in (v) of 3.1.*

Proof. As in 3.1 we have that $\widehat{T(\cdot)}(1-p)$ is a 1-1 triple morphism $A \rightarrow B^{**}(1-p)$. Let Z be the triple system $\widehat{T(A)}(1-p) = (1-q)\widehat{T(A)} = (1-q)\widehat{T(A)}(1-p)$. By 2.10, U is a unitary of Z . If $v = T(a_0)$ is an isometry (resp. coisometry) of B , then $V = \hat{v}(1-p) = (1-q)\hat{v}$ is an isometry (resp. coisometry) of $(1-q)B^{**}(1-p)$ clearly. Therefore $1-p$ is the identity of Z^*Z if v is an isometry, so that in this case $U^*U = (1-p)$. Similarly in the ‘coisometry’ case. $\square$

Remark. If $T(A)$ contains a unitary v of B , and if we let $T' = v^*T(\cdot)$, then the triple system Z' in B generated by $T'(A)$ is a C^* -algebra equal to v^*Z , where Z is the triple system generated by $T(A)$ as in the proof above. As in the proof of 3.1 we obtain a triple morphism $\theta' : Z' \rightarrow A$, and $N' = \text{Ker } \theta'$ is easily seen to equal v^*N . Thus the support projection $p' \in B^{**}$ for N'^*N' , equals p . We also have that the associated support projection q for NN^* (see Lemma 2.9) equals vpv^* , since $vpv^*z = vv^*zp = zp$ for all $z \in Z$. Thus q is unitarily equivalent to p .

Let us amplify item (iv) of Theorem 3.1 in the case that $T(1_A) = 1_B$. Recall that the projection p discussed in the theorem lives in B^{**} . Thus if H_u is the Hilbert space of the universal representation of B , then p may be viewed as a projection on H_u . Let $K = \text{Ran } p$. We may write $T = (1-p)T(\cdot)(1-p) + pT(\cdot)p$. Setting $S = pT(\cdot)p$ (a completely positive unital map into $B(K^\perp)$) and $\theta = (1-p)T(\cdot)(1-p)$ (a unital *-homomorphism into $B(K)$), we have $T = \pi \oplus S$. That is,

Corollary 3.4. *Let $T : A \rightarrow B$ be a unital linear map between unital C^* -algebras. Let H_u be the Hilbert space of the universal representation of B . Then T is a*

complete isometry if and only if there exists a projection $p \in B''$ with respect to which H_u splits as $L \oplus L^\perp$, and with respect to which T may be written as

$$T(a) = \begin{bmatrix} \pi(a) & 0 \\ 0 & S(a) \end{bmatrix},$$

for a unital 1-1 $*$ -homomorphism $\pi : A \rightarrow (1-p)B''(1-p) \subset B(L)$, and for a completely positive unital $S : A \rightarrow pB''p \subset B(L^\perp)$. Thus a compression of T to the reducing subspace L of H_u , is a 1-1 $*$ -homomorphism.

Of course a similar statement holds in the nonunital case.

In the previous corollaries, and in 3.1, one may not hope to have $p \in B$ in general, even if B is a W^* -algebra. Indeed if $B \subset B(H)$, one cannot hope to have the important projection p above in $B(H)$ (unless $H = H_u$ as we just discussed). See Example 3.7. Of course if B is finite dimensional, then $p \in B$:

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose that $T : M_{m,n} \rightarrow M_{r,s}$ is a triple morphism which is not identically zero. Then T is 1-1, and there exist unitary matrices U and V of appropriate sizes, such that $T(A) = U \text{diag}\{A, A, \dots, A, 0\} V$.*

Proof. This is essentially elementary, thus we merely sketch the proof. By [12] 2.1 (iv), we may view T as the 1-2-corner of a $*$ -homomorphism $\pi : M_{m+n, m+n} \rightarrow M_{r+s, r+s}$. Since $M_{m+n, m+n}$ is simple, π (and therefore also T) is 1-1. It is well known that such $*$ -homomorphisms are unitarily equivalent to a map of the form $B \mapsto (B \otimes I_k) \oplus 0$. Indeed looking at the elementary proof of this latter fact gives the desired result, on inspection of the ‘1-2-corner’. $\square$

Corollary 3.6. *Suppose that $T : M_{m,n} \rightarrow M_{r,s}$ is a linear map. Then T is a complete isometry if and only if there exist unitaries U and V of appropriate sizes, such that*

$$UT(x)V = \begin{bmatrix} x & 0 \\ 0 & S(x) \end{bmatrix},$$

where $S : M_{m,n} \rightarrow M_{r-m, s-n}$ is a complete contraction.

Proof. We apply 2.12 to see that there exist projections e and f in M_s and M_r respectively, such that

$$(1-f)T(z) = T(z)(1-e) = (1-f)T(z)(1-e)$$

for all $z \in M_{m,n}$, and such that these expressions define a 1-1 triple morphism θ from $M_{m,n}$ into $M_{r,s}$. That is, a reducing compression of T is a triple morphism. Now apply the last lemma to θ . $\square$

This corollary generalizes a result of Seth Hain (the case $n = 1, m = r = s$) obtained by different methods during a Research Experiences for Undergraduates project in the summer of 2000, supervised by the first author [10].

The case that $m = n$ and $T(1) = 1$ is essentially 7.1 in [7].

It is easy to generalize the corollary to maps between finite dimensional triple systems [13].

Example 3.7.

In the light of the previous results, one might expect that if H is infinite dimensional, and if $T : M_n \rightarrow B(H)$ is a complete isometry, then there exists a projection

p in $B(H)$ with respect to which $T(A) = U \text{diag}\{A, S(A)\}V$ as in the previous corollary. The following example shows that nothing like this is possible.

Suppose that $\{\epsilon_k\}$ is a sequence of numbers in $(0, 1)$ strictly decreasing to 0. Define $\varphi_k^1 \in (\ell_n^\infty)^*$ by $\varphi_k^1((a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)) = a_1(1 - \epsilon_k) + \frac{\epsilon_k}{n-1} \sum_{j=2}^n a_j$. Note that φ_k^1 is a state of ℓ_n^∞ . Similarly define states $\varphi_k^r(\vec{a}) = a_r(1 - \epsilon_k) + \frac{\epsilon_k}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq r} a_j$. Define $\psi_k : \ell_n^\infty \rightarrow \ell_n^\infty$ by $\psi_k(\vec{a}) = (\varphi_k^1(\vec{a}), \dots, \varphi_k^n(\vec{a}))$. Then ψ_k is a unital contraction, and hence is completely contractive and completely positive. Note also that

$$|\varphi_k^r(\vec{a})| \geq |a_r|(1 - \epsilon_k) - \frac{\epsilon_k}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq r} |a_j| \geq |a_r| - 2\epsilon_k \max_k |a_k|,$$

from which it is easy to see that

$$\|\psi_k(\vec{a})\|_\infty \geq (1 - 2\epsilon_k) \max_k |a_k| = (1 - 2\epsilon_k) \|\vec{a}\|_\infty.$$

Thus $\sup_k \|\psi_k(\vec{a})\|_\infty = \|\vec{a}\|_\infty$, for all $\vec{a} \in \ell_n^\infty$.

Define a map $\Phi : \ell_n^\infty \rightarrow \ell^\infty(\ell_n^\infty)$ by $\Phi(\vec{a}) = (\psi_k(\vec{a}))_k$. Then Φ is a unital isometry between subspaces of $C(K)$ spaces, and is therefore a complete isometry ([20] Theorem 3.8). We consider the canonical ‘main diagonal’ *-representation $\pi : \ell^\infty(\ell_n^\infty) \rightarrow B(H)$, where $H = \oplus_{k=1}^\infty H_i$, and each H_i is a copy of $\mathbb{C}^n$. Let $\Psi = \pi \circ \Phi$. Then Ψ is a unital complete isometry. We claim that if there exists a projection $p \in B(H)$ such that

$$(1 - p)\Psi(\cdot) = \Psi(\cdot)(1 - p)$$

is a *-homomorphism, then $p = 1$ and this *-homomorphism is the zero map. Here $\Psi : \ell_n^\infty \rightarrow B(H)$, but it is easy to see how Ψ may be extended to a unital complete isometry $M_n \rightarrow B(H)$ (extend the ψ_k above to maps $M_n \rightarrow M_n$ by viewing ℓ_n^∞ as the ‘main diagonal’ and multiplying off-diagonal terms by $1 - \epsilon_k$). Let $A = M_n$ or ℓ_n^∞ .

To this end, note that if there were such p , then p commutes with $D_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Psi(\vec{e}_i)$ for each $i = 1, \dots, n$. Suppose that $A_{ij} = P_i p P_j$, where P_i is the projection of H onto H_i . Let E_{ij} be the matrix units in M_n . Note that $\psi_k(\vec{e}_1) = ((1 - \epsilon_k), \frac{\epsilon_k}{n-1}, \dots, \frac{\epsilon_k}{n-1})$, so that $\Psi(\vec{e}_1)$ is the matrix

$$D_1 = \text{diag}\{(1 - \epsilon_1), \frac{\epsilon_1}{n-1} I_{n-1}, (1 - \epsilon_2), \frac{\epsilon_2}{n-1} I_{n-1}, \dots\}.$$

That p commutes with D_1 implies that $A_{ij} = 0$ if $i \neq j$; and that A_{ii} commutes with E_{11} for all i . Since p is a projection we obtain $A_{ii} E_{11} = E_{11}$ or $A_{ii} E_{11} = 0$. A similar argument applied to D_r for $2 \leq r \leq n$ implies that $A_{ii} E_{rr}$ equals E_{rr} or 0. Thus p and $1 - p$ are ‘diagonal matrices’, with either 0’s or 1’s on the diagonal. Since $(1 - p)\Psi(\cdot)$ is a *-homomorphism, we know that $(1 - p)D_r$ is a projection for each r . However then it is clear from the form of $1 - p$ and D_r , that $(1 - p)D_r$ must be the zero projection for every r . Also, $p = 1$. Therefore $(1 - p)\Psi(\cdot)$ is the zero map.

Indeed suppose that there exists projections $p, q \in B(H)$ such that

$$(1 - q)\Psi(\cdot) = \Psi(\cdot)(1 - p)$$

is a triple morphism ψ . Inserting 1, gives $p = q$, and so $\psi(A)$ is a triple system containing $(1 - p)$. Hence $\psi(A)$ is a unital C^* -algebra, and ψ is a unital

$*$ -homomorphism. This puts us back in the previous case, so that $p = q = 1$ and ψ is the zero map.

Acknowledgments: We thank Louis Labuschagne for helpful discussions and input during a visit of the first author. We are indebted to the University of South Africa for support for that visit.

REFERENCES

- [1] W. B. Arveson, *Subalgebras of C^* -algebras*, Acta Math. **123** (1969), 141-224.
- [2] W. B. Arveson, *Subalgebras of C^* -algebras II*, Acta Math. **128** (1972), 271-308.
- [3] D. P. Blecher, *The Shilov boundary of an operator space, and the characterization theorems*, J. Funct. An. **182** (2001), 280-343.
- [4] D. P. Blecher, E. G. Effros and V. Zarikian, *One-sided M -Ideals and Multipliers in Operator Spaces I*, to appear Pacif. J. Math.
- [5] D. P. Blecher and L. E. Labuschagne, Work in progress.
- [6] M. D. Choi and E.G. Effros, *The completely positive lifting problem for C^* -algebras*, Ann. Math. **104** (1976), 585-609.
- [7] M. D. Choi and E.G. Effros, *Injectivity and operator spaces*, J. Funct. An. **24** (1977), 156-209.
- [8] P. G. Dixon, *Non-closed sums in closed ideals in Banach algebras*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **128** (2000), 3647-3654.
- [9] E. G. Effros, N. Ozawa and Z-J. Ruan, *On injectivity and nuclearity for operator spaces*, Duke J. Math. **110** (2001), 489-521.
- [10] S. Hain, *Algebra and Matrix Normed Spaces*, Rose-Hulman Undergrad. Math. J. **2** (2) (2001).
- [11] M. Hamana, *Injective envelopes of operator systems*, Publ. R.I.M.S. Kyoto Univ. **15** (1979), 773-785.
- [12] M. Hamana, *Triple envelopes and Silov boundaries of operator spaces*, Math. J. Toyama University **22** (1999), 77-93.
- [13] D. Hay, Notes for Ph. D. Thesis project supervised by D. P. Blecher.
- [14] W. Holsztynski, *Continuous mappings induced by isometries of spaces of continuous functions*, Studia Math. **24** (1966), 133-136.
- [15] R. V. Kadison, *Isometries of operator algebras*, Ann. of Math. **54** (1951), 325-338.
- [16] E. Kirchberg, *On restricted perturbations in inverse images and a description of normalizer algebras in C^* -algebras*, J. Funct. An. **129** (1995), 1-34.
- [17] E. Kirchberg, *Commutants of unitaries in UHF algebras and functorial properties of exactness*, J. Reine Angew Math. **452** (1994), 39-77.
- [18] E. Kirchberg and S. Wassermann, *C^* -algebras generated by operator systems*, J. Funct. Analysis **155** (1998), 324-351.
- [19] B. Magajna, *Hilbert modules and tensor products of operator spaces*, Linear Operators, Banach Center Publ. Vol. 38, Inst. of Math. Polish Acad. Sci. (1997), 227-246.
- [20] V. I. Paulsen, *Completely bounded maps and dilations*, Pitman Research Notes in Math., Longman, London, 1986.
- [21] G. Pedersen, *C^* -algebras and their automorphism groups*, Academic Press (1979).
- [22] M. A. Rieffel, *Morita equivalence for operator algebras*, Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics **38** Part 1 (1982), 285-298.
- [23] M. A. Rieffel, *Unitary representations of group extensions; an algebraic approach to the theory of Mackey and Blattner*, Studies in Analysis, Adv. Math. Suppl. Stud. **4** (1979), 43-82.
- [24] M. A. Rieffel, *Morita equivalence for C^* -algebras and W^* -algebras*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **5** (1974), 51-96.
- [25] G. Wittstock, *Extensions of completely bounded module morphisms*, Proceedings of conference on operator algebras and group representations, Neptum, 238-250, Pitman (1983).

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON, HOUSTON, TX 77204-3008

E-mail address, David P. Blecher: dblecher@math.uh.edu

E-mail address, Damon Hay: dhay@math.uh.edu